

There was an objection, then:

"Answer: I was carrying out, counsel, a prior sworn oath that I would not reveal certain information without authorization, and I have maintained that oath.

"Question: Even to the point of lying?"

There was colloquy.

"By Mr. McTernan:

"Question: Is that right?

"Answer: I have maintained that oath and that promise, and under no conceivable conditions will I retreat from it unless I am given the full authorization and clearance by the FBI.

"Question: In other words, you will tell a lie under oath in a court of law rather than run counter to your instructions from the FBI; is that right?

"Answer: If the interests of my Government are at stake. In the face of enemies at home and abroad, if maintaining secrecy of the techniques and methods of operation
7149 of the FBI, who have the responsibility of the protection of our people, I say I will do it, and I will do it a thousand times.

"Question: Under oath?

"Answer: Under oath.

"Question: In a court of law?

"Answer: Yes.

"Question: Before a jury of your peers you will lie?

"Answer: I will do it for the security of this Government when I know that you, counsel, are interested in knowing the techniques of the FBI so that the criminal Communist aliens can use them in order to prevent the effective work of the FBI."

Do you recall being asked these questions and making those answers? A. That is correct.

MR. MARCANTONIO: At this point the Government
7173 stipulates that the witness testified in the case of the People v. Nelson and testified as appears in the

transcript of that case on pages 4654 to 4685 inclusive, commencing at the bottom of page 4654 with the question by Mr. McTernan, "Now this National Training School course," and so forth, down to the answer "yes" in the middle of page 4685.

MR. PAISLEY: Yes, and beginning on page—

MR. MARCANTONIO: I am going to ask preliminary questions on the other one.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to that stipulation at this point in the record it is stipulated that these questions and answers as they appear in this transcript will be reproduced.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: And does the stipulation include that the witness was asked the questions there appearing and gave the answers as they so appear?

MR. MARCANTONIO: Yes.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: All right.

(The portion of the Witness' testimony referred to, pages 4654 to 4685 of the Nelson case follows:)

7186 Q. Now, referring back to my earlier question concerning the ultimate objective of the Communist Party being to assist in bringing about an economic system known as Socialism, I will ask you whether you were taught that it was in connection with bringing about Socialism that the word 'overthrow' was used in your reading and discussion? A. It was used. The word 'overthrow' was used in connection with the word 'Socialism', yes, it was. It can be found in a number of books and documents used in that sense.

Q. I am not sure your answer completely covers the question. Isn't it true that in your instructions the word 'overthrow' was used in relation to the process of bringing about Socialism or a Socialistic form of society? A. Well, the word 'overthrow' was used in the sense that the bourgeois capitalist system of government would be overthrown and a system of Socialism established. That is the sense in which it was used in my study and according to my best recollection.

Q. I refer again to page 188 of your testimony in 7187 the Yanish case. I ask you if these questions were put to you and if you gave these answers:

'Q—I asked you if it was not the ultimate objective of the Communist Party to assist in bringing about a system of economic society which is known as Socialism? 'A—Yes.

'Q—Correct? 'A—Yes.

'Q—And that is what you were taught, isn't it? 'A—I was taught that it was to bring about a system of Socialism, yes, that is correct.

'Q—And it is in that connection that the use of the word "overthrow" appears or appeared in your teachings and in your discussions. Isn't that right? That is, an overthrow of the capitalist system of economic society? 'A—That is correct.'

Did you make those answers to those questions? A. If those questions were asked me and you are reading from the record, I would say yes.

Q. And those answers were correct at the time you gave them, weren't they? A. They were correct at that time and they are correct now.

Q. Fine. Now, in your instructions in the Communist Party the word 'overthrow' was used to mean a basic and fundamental change in the economic system. Isn't that right? A. The word 'overthrow' according to the way that I was taught, meant the complete destruction of the present system of society by a revolutionary change, by the revolutionary destruction of all the governmental forms, a drastic and fundamental change in the economic, social and political structure of the entire nation and its reorganization along the line of a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Q. Now, Mr. Johnson, referring to page 187 of your testimony in the Yanish case, March 1, 1948, I will ask you if these questions were put to you and you gave these answers:

'Q—Isn't it true that the word "overthrow" in the studies that you made from the literature that was made available

to you in your Training School—isn't it true that the use of the word "overthrow" was confined to the idea of a radical change in the economical system? A—basic and fundamental change.

7189 Q—Isn't that correct? A—A basic and fundamental change, I would say.

Did you make those answers? A. Yes.

Q. Were they correct at the time you gave them? A. That is correct.

Q. And they are correct now, aren't they? A. Yes.

7192 Q. And you were taught, were you not, that the political understanding of the people, as we have used this phrase in the last few questions, meant, in short, their awareness that the ills of capitalism could be finally and completely solved only by a transition to

7193 Socialism? A. No. We were taught that the only way that the problems of the mass of the people could be finally solved was by the overthrow, revolutionary overthrow, of the capitalist system and the establishment of a Soviet form of Government.

7197 Q. And you were taught, were you, Mr. Johnson, that a small group like the Communist Party, not having the support of the majority of the people, would attempt to obtain political power? Let me rephrase that somewhat, because obviously all efforts are efforts to obtain political power after trying to convince people of a program. You were not taught that a small group, such as the Communist Party was, when you were a member of it, not having the support of a majority of the people, would attempt to bring about a revolution, were you? A. We were taught that the Communist Party would not attempt a revolution in the United States unless it was in a position to win it, that is, to carry it through successfully.

Q. Including having the support of the majority
7198 of the people? A. Yes.

7201 Q. We will just go back a moment. Then it was was it not, a process of education through political experience? A. Through a process of education, through the involvement of people in daily struggles, rising higher and higher through political understanding and through political consciousness to the degree that they will accept the leadership of the Communist Party; and in attaining such a high point by the Communist Party they could carry through successfully a change in the existing form of government through the medium of revolution.

.

7202 Q. All right. Weren't you taught that a revolution involving an effort to bring about this basic and fundamental change we have been talking about would occur only at a time of deep economic crisis? A. Yes.

Q. You were not, while you were a member of the Communist Party, taught anything concrete or practical about seizing power in the United States; your discussion was on a purely theoretical basis, wasn't it? A. In the school it was on a theoretical level, that's true, and it was based on the practical revolutionary experiences of the Bolshevik Party of Russia, the lessons of the French revolution. In short, it was based primarily upon the accumulative revolutionary experiences of the ages, and this revolutionary experience served as a sort of guide in our work to carry through revolution in this country.

.

7204 Q. You were taught that the Communist Party intended that the revolution could be accomplished by peaceful methods of persuasion and explanation weren't you? A. No. We were never taught that.

.

7206 Q. Let me ask you, Mr. Johnson, referring again to your testimony in the Yanish case, page 235,—that is your testimony on March 1, 1948,—whether you gave this answer:

'A—I was taught that Trotzky disagreed with Lenin inso-

far as the continuation of the revolution in Europe was concerned. Lenin had this point of view that the seizure of power in Russia should, for the time being, end there, and there should be a consolidation of the workers' power. Trotsky wanted to use the Workers Army to march into other countries of Europe at that particular time and assist the Communist forces in those countries to establish a Communist government and a dictatorship of the proletariat in those countries. In other words, he (referring to Trotsky) wanted to use that historic period to forcibly establish a similar type of government that they had in Russia at that time.

Q—And it was because of that basic disagreement that Trotsky was expelled from the Soviet Union; isn't that right? A—It was because of that difference he was expelled.'

7207 You gave that testimony, didn't you? A. Yes.

Q. And that testimony was true at that time?

A. Yes.

7343 **Frank Strauss Meyer** called as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, has examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STORY:

7344 Q. Mr. Meyer, were you at any time ever a member of the Communist Party? A. I was.

Q. Where and when did you first join the Communist Party? A. In 1932 in England, the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Q. Prior to the time you joined the Communist Party in Great Britain had you been associated with any Communist Party groups? A. I had been the founder and the first president of the Oxford University October Club, which was a club which technically was organized for the study of Communism. Actually it was rather a propaganda group.

Q. Mr. Meyer, were you associated with any Communist Party groups while you were attending the London School of Economics?

7346 Q. Mr. Meyer, you have testified that you left the London School of Economics in the spring of 1934—

A. There is an error in that, as a matter of fact. I suddenly remembered something. As student work I was not associated with the YCL, but in the summer I did some very active work in the YCL during two of those years and was

7347 associated with the secretariat of the Central Committee of the British Young Communist League during that time.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Will you ask your last question again, please?

By MR. STORY:

Q. You have testified that you left the London School of Economics in the spring of 1934. Did you leave the London School of Economics voluntarily? A. No, sir. I was expelled.

Q. Why were you expelled? A. I had been elected President of the Student Governing Body which at the London School of Economics is called the student union, and in the course of political campaign against the authorities of the school—Sir William Beveridge was director at that time—we ended our campaign with an act of open defiance of the authorities and I was expelled.

Q. Did you remain in England after you were expelled from the London School? A. A month or two.

Q. Where did you go after leaving England? A. Immediately to Paris.

Q. Was your trip to Paris connected in any way with Communist Party activities? A. Yes. I went there to work for a couple of months. I wasn't certain what I was going to do next, but immediately started work on the
7348 preparations for a world student and youth congress against war and fascism under the aegis of the World

Committee Against War and Fascism, the Amsterdam-Playel Committee.

7350 Q. When did you arrive in the United States?

A. July, I believe, 1934. It was summer, anyway.

Q. Were you connected in any way with the Communist Party of the United States after you returned to the United States? A. I was.

Q. When did you get in touch with the Communist Party?

A. I had a transfer in the form of a letter of introduction from Harry Pollitt, the secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, addressed to the head of the Communist Party of the United States, which discussed the work I had been doing and my position and introduced me to them for transfer to the American Party.

Q. Who was Harry Pollitt? A. He was general secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Q. Did you retain a copy of this letter? A. No, sir.

Q. You have stated that this letter was in the form of a letter of transfer. What do you mean by that, Mr. Meyer?

A. I mean that just as if I had moved from one section of England to another or from one section of the United States to another as a member of the Communist Party and

7351 Communist International through the Communist Party, I was transferred. That is to say, I had to be introduced to the authorities of the new section to which I came both technically in terms of the transfer of membership and practically in terms of my ability, my position in the movement, where I had been, what I was capable of, and so on.

Q. Did you fill out an application to join the Communist Party after you arrived in the United States? A. Of the United States? No, sir. I didn't have to. It was a transfer from one section of the movement to another.

Q. What movement? A. The Communist movement, the Communist International in this case.

7357. By MR. STORY:

Q. Mr. Meyer, did you go to Canada to attend the Canadian Congress against War and Fascism? A. Yes. As I say, after this period I then went up to Canada.

Q. Approximately when did you go to Canada? A. It is hard to remember. It must have been either late August or early September. I was around New York for a month or a month and a half. I don't remember.

Q. Did you attend any other conventions or conferences while you were in Canada? A. The convention of the Canadian Student League, and the convention of the Young Communist League of Canada.

Q. Did any of the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States attend any of these conferences?

MR. STORY: This is testimony showing the World Communist Movement.

7358 Q. Will you answer the question? A. Gil Green and Max Weiss formed a delegation from the Young Communist League of the United States.

Q. What position did Green and Weiss hold at that time? A. Green was the national secretary of the YCL and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party as well, and also I think at that point fourth secretary of the Young Communist International. Weiss I am pretty sure was national educational director of the YCL. Whether he was a member of the Central Committee of the Party or not I do not know. There were several leading YCL'ers who were.

Q. Mr. Meyer, after you had returned from Canada were you given any assignment by the Communist Party of the United States? A. Yes. There were some discussions with this delegation in Canada. As a matter of fact, the Canadians wanted me to stay there for awhile and work there, but it was finally decided that I should go to Chicago for a

month or so and participate in the preparations of the Youth part of the Second United States Congress against War and Fascism and the final decision as to what I should do would be made in Chicago upon the conclusion of that conference or in conversations during the work.

7359 Q. Did you go to Chicago? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you arrive in Chicago? A. I have just been thinking that my date on the other must be out a bit because this Congress was certainly as early as September. That is to say, I am trying to cover the summer and I am not quite sure how the summer was divided but it must have been in September.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What must have been in September?

THE WITNESS: The Congress in Chicago. Because I entered the University when it opened and the Congress was over.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What time did you say you were in Canada?

THE WITNESS: I think I said August or early September. It is still possible that was the case but since I don't know whether I returned in late July or early July it is difficult.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Were you given any other assignments by the Communist Party of the United States after you arrived in Chicago? A. After the second United States Congress against War and Fascism was over and the final decision was made, it was agreed that I should stay in Chicago and continue graduate work at the University.

7360 MR. LAFOLLETTE: Who were the leaders?

THE WITNESS: Gil Green and a man named Max, who was the representative of the Young Communist International, and Max Weiss.

Where did these conversations take place?

THE WITNESS: In Chicago, after the Canadian business where the question of what I was going to do had been

discussed. I was assigned to become the Secretary of the Youth Section of the American League against War and Fascism in the Illinois-Indiana area, and also drawn into the work of the District Bureau of the Young Communist League for that same district and also made responsible for the Party work on the campus of the University of Chicago, where I was a graduate student.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Let me ask you something. You say you were assigned to become secretary. Were you assigned to become a candidate for secretaryship or how was that assignment to be made?

THE WITNESS: Since the Party really controlled the Congress and the local Congress, the state congress, completely, the Party said "You will have this job."

When the Nominations Committee of the Congress came in my name was on the Nominations Committee slate because the Party controlled the Nominations Committee.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: All right.

THE WITNESS: And nobody objected.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Was there any contest or vote?

THE WITNESS: The Nominations Committee report was accepted.

7375 Q. Mr. Meyer, you have testified you were the educational director for the Indiana-Illinois District for a certain period of time. Were any full time Communist Party schools organized during this period? A. Did you say full time schools?

7376 Q. Yes. A. Yes, sir. There were a good number.

The regular district schools of the Party were run once, sometimes twice a year, which are the longest and most important of the full time schools, and they ran 3, 4, 5, or 6 weeks.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Excuse me. By full time school you don't mean a school beginning in September and ending in June?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You mean a school at which people give their full attendance over a limited period of time.

THE WITNESS: That is right. Drop their job or whatever they are doing and work from morning to night at the school.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: These are Party schools, only for Party members. Then there were others of various types. We would run maybe perhaps a school for two or three weeks for trade unionists, party trained unionists or maybe one for a couple of weeks for professionals or we would organize a series of sectional schools where for four or five days in half a dozen of the more important sections we would run very brief intensive ones. Or perhaps we would get together a group of people who had time available because of off season occupation in a given industry and would run a week's school. There was a network of full time party schools, the most important of which was the district school itself.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Did you have anything to do with organizing the schools? A. I was responsible solely for that. That was one of the aspects of my work.

Q. Did you participate as instructor in any of these schools? A. Occasionally, yes. I should say in most of them or many of them for one or two or three days in one of the sections of the curriculum. I was in and out. We had other people doing the teaching.

Q. Were these schools limited to Communist Party leaders? A. Oh, Lord, yes. I am sorry, yes.

Q. Were any steps taken to conceal the existence of these schools or were they openly held?

Q. Were these schools publicly announced in any way? A. Never.

Q. Were any steps taken to conceal the existence of these schools?

THE WITNESS: Schools of this type were limited so far as knowledge of them was concerned to leading committees of the Party responsible for their operation, to the students in them, and sometimes to the person responsible for the work in the Party. In other words, the only people who were supposed to know about them were those who organized them and the district bureau, the district leadership on the one hand, the students who were selected and in many cases if one of the students selected was a section educational director, the section organizer who was responsible for his work or the person responsible for his work in some other activity, because steps had to be taken in that case about his work and so on and so forth. Otherwise, they were completely limited as far as knowledge of them was concerned. They were conducted altogether to maintain that concealment.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Please tell the Panel what precautions were taken by the organizers of these schools to conceal the existence of the schools. A. This would vary from time to time. At times simply almost formal ones. Simply not speaking about them, and holding them in a place where no one would be around. At other times extremely severe precautions were taken.

Q. What were those precautions? A. During such periods, say, as the 1939 to 1941 period, the whole organization was on a conspiratorial basis; that is to say—

7380 THE WITNESS: I used the word conspiracy rather technically. The schools were conducted in those ways which in the Party were called in accordance with the rules of conspiracy. That is to say, a series of precautions were taken which one tended to learn in upper Party activities as being the rules of conspiracy. I will tell you exactly what I mean. Those who were going to the school were

notified, made arrangements if they happened to be workers
 to take a leave of absence from their job or whatever it
 might be, without saying the reason why or rather making
 an excuse for it. None but perhaps their organizer
 7381 in the area they were in or the work they were in
 knew what they were doing. To their other Party
 members they were simply taking a leave of absence or were
 doing some other work. They would arrive, let us say in
 Chicago, if the school were being held there, and they
 usually were held in or around Chicago; and go to a house
 of a party member who was not publicly or widely known,
 would there be contacted, gotten in touch with, and notified
 where to report, which would be either—in the summer we
 have held them at the Camp which was run by the Party
 which was a sort of recreation camp but had sections which
 could be used for this purpose, or in winter and when we
 were more conspiratorial in workers halls belonging to one
 of what is called in the Party language organizations such
 as to say the Hungarian Federation or this or that. I don't
 know really in all cases to whom these halls belonged. We
 referred to them as the Russian Hall or the Hungarian Hall
 or whatever it might be. There are these language organi-
 zations of an insurance kind that go back to the old days
 of the Soviet Party. For such a hall arrangements would
 have been made in advance. The students would meet in
 groups of one or two and go to the hall, timing their arrival
 so that not more than one or two people would arrive at
 once and so that there would be no influx of people. In these
 periods the schools were very small, eight, nine, ten or
 eleven students. The instructors would arrive in the
 7382 same way. All papers during the day would be burned
 at the end of the day. The books would be removed
 from the room used at night in suitcases so that the Hall
 was then in its perfectly normal appearance. Of course the
 students were told never to use the telephone in the build-
 ing. Their letters from their wives would come to either
 the address they were staying at or some other address they
 were given in Chicago. They would be completely isolated

from the Party in Chicago while they were at the school. Their social activities or what social or cultural or propaganda activities they had would be conducted as a group at night. I could probably think of other things, but essentially when I say rules of conspiracy I mean they were isolated effectually, any idea of what they were doing, from anybody but a few people in the Party, and all measures were taken to maintain that, which are in terms of what the Party calls rules of conspiracy, of not talking to anybody that doesn't have to be talked to about a thing, of maintaining complete protection of written material, of not discussing on the telephone any such questions, and so on.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: May I ask you this: You were the head of the educational section which you testified was in effect the subsequent organization of the old agit-prop organization. Would you yourself hire the halls?

THE WITNESS: The type of hall I am thinking of 7383 belonged to groups that had once been language federations before 1919. We simply would go and see the head of the language organization or the Party leader in the language organization who very often was the head and say we wanted a hall. We wouldn't even tell them what for. We wanted it at such and such a time for so many days and usually it was all right. They might have something on and we would have to try another one.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Would you do that personally on any occasions?

THE WITNESS: Always personally, or someone working directly under me would do it.

7384 Q. Mr. Meyer, what textbooks were used, if any, at these schools that you organized?

MR. ABT: May we have the date, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I think we have the date. I don't remember it, but it is in the record. It doesn't hurt to give it again.

THE WITNESS: The dates on which I was responsible for this work directly was 1938 to 1941.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I thought that was it. Go ahead.

7385

THE WITNESS: The fundamental textbooks used before the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared—that must have appeared late in 1939, but I can't date it exactly. I can date it by epoch. It appeared during that general 1939 to 1940 epoch, but I think it appeared in late 1939 or it might have been early 1940. At any rate before that appeared the major text books used, at the core of the whole problem—there were others used but the essential ones always were the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Foundations of Leninism by Stalin. The whole course of Marxism-Leninism was organized around these two. Then, so to speak, radiating from them were special problems: Lenin's State and Revolution, Lenin's Imperialism, Stalin's Problems of Leninism. I should say these were the central ones, except at one point also; I think in the earlier part of this period primarily, there were three rather widely used textbooks of excerpts from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. One was called Strategy and Tactics, another the Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, and another one the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. After the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared it became the Central Textbook.

7408

Q. Mr. Meyer, you have testified concerning the campaign prior to the time the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was published in this country. Was the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union used by the Communist Party in its training or instructions after it was printed? A. Yes.

Q. How was the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union used after it was available for distribution?

A. It became, as I think I stated before, the central Marxist-Leninist textbook, the central textbooks for the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, and I think to explain how it was

used it is necessary to say a word or two about the way the book itself is written and organized.

7409 THE WITNESS: When I say how it is organized I
 mean there is a definite scheme in the organization
 7410 of it. I don't want to speak so much of the substan-
 tive content but of the way in which the chapters are
 organized, particularly the first half dozen or so. The same
 general principle applies to the rest of them, but it is clear
 as to the first half dozen. It is a history of the Communist
 Party of the Soviet Union, Bolshevik. Each chapter begins
 with a description of the political and social situation at the
 time in Russia. Then it discusses the development of political
 struggle at that time. Then it puts forward the kind
 of task faced the party. Then it shows the ideological
 struggle that took place within the Bolshevik Party at the
 time, and before the Bolshevik Party within the Russian
 Socialist Democratic Labor Party, about this problem, and
 then summarizes, first, the actual steps that were taken
 concretely at that time by the Party and secondly theoretical
 principles deduced from those concrete steps. As a
 matter of fact, it summarizes thereby a number of the lead-
 ing documents of Leninism. That is to say, in that last
 section of which I just spoke, one chapter would summarize
 one book which Lenin wrote polemically at that time; in
 another chapter, another book.

As to how it was used, in teaching it wherever I had any
 experience with it, and this was both the general directive
 which reached me as to how it was to be done and those
 which I passed on and the training of teachers which I gave
 and caused to be given, the approach was this: The
 7411 historical part proper, that is to say the description
 of the Russian situation, was very quickly sum-
 marized, or if it was a type of school where there was time
 for the student to read, he was told to read it. It was very
 briefly discussed in class simply to get the salient points, to
 get, so to speak, the problem. Then essentially the question

was asked as to how did the Russian Bolsheviks solve this problem? What problems were facing them, what were the issues, how was it solved? Then from that, what general principles of guidance to a revolutionary party can be deduced that are permanently correct in the modern period of time?

In other words, the major material of the book, not necessarily the major in content in terms of number of pages devoted to it, but the essential core of each chapter was the general theoretical principles derived from the Russian put to the students as general principles of revolutionary action which they were then to discuss in terms of the whole total current situation in which they were working, in terms of other historical examples and so on, in order to learn from it, I think the statement of it was, not a dogmatic but a living guide to revolutionary action from the experiences of the Bolsheviks and the writings of Lenin and Stalin.

7413 MR. STORY: I thought my question, Mr. Chairman, asked the witness if the same textbooks were used during the period of the Communist Political Association as were used during the prior years by the Communist Party of the United States.

7414 THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, which was derived both from teaching at the Jefferson School and from conversations engaged in at other Party educational activities, there was a profound de-emphasis during this period of the basic textbooks of Marxism-Leninism. I can't say that they were never used, but they were certainly de-emphasized, to a considerable degree passed over, and central teaching was around the current documents of the Party, particularly Earl Browder's Teheran pamphlet; "Tehran Road to Peace," I believe, and the other national committee documents, speeches of Browder and so on, which put forward and amplified the

so-called Tehran line, which was the line of peaceful co-existence of the United States and the Soviet Union and peaceful transition to socialism.

7422 Q. Mr. Meyer, during your membership in the Communist Party did you meet any representative from the Communist International in the United States? A. On one occasion there in Chicago I met a man who carried the name of Edwards, who was at that time the representative of the Communist International in the United States.

BY MR. LaFOLLETTE:

7424 Let me ask you, from whom did you first hear the name Edwards?

THE WITNESS: I think, as a matter of fact—in fact 7425 I am sure—that before I left England in talking over with Pollitt the American Party and giving me one or two personal messages to friends of his here, I asked him who was the rep in the United States at the time and he told me Edwards was the rep and had been for a year or two.

BY MR. STORY:

7436 Q. Did you know Edwards by any other name in the United States, Mr. Meyer? A. Some years later I met him under the name of Berger for a few moments, considerably later, in 1944 I guess it was. I didn't 7437 know him under any other name, except in so far as newspapers are concerned.

Q. Did he have a first name or was Berger all you knew? A. Hans Berger.

Q. Did you know Edwards by any other name in the United States at any time? A. Personally? No, I didn't. I only know what I read in the paper.

Q. Did you see Edwards' picture in the paper at any time? A. Yes.

Q. Did you recognize him as the Edwards that you had met in Chicago and also in New York? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What name was in the newspaper? A. Gerhard Eisler.

Q. Mr. Meyer; was the Communist Party of the United States a member of the Communist International during your membership in the party? A. Up to the passage of the Voorhis Act, yes, sir.

Q. What was the date of that? A. That I am not entirely sure of. It must have been in 1939 or 1940. It was during that period, but I can't remember the exact date of it. 1940

I am pretty sure, but it may have been late 1939.
7438 Q. What did the Communist Party do at that time?

A. Disaffiliated from the Communist International.

Q. Were you present at any meeting at any time when the reasons for this disaffiliation was discussed? A. I was present at the State Committee meeting at which the small delegation to the emergency convention which did the disaffiliating reported back to the Illinois-Indiana District.

Q. What was the substance of that report? A. The substance of that report was that what had been done was a simple act of expediency, that it changed nothing fundamentally or significantly, and that it had to be done in order to preserve the legality of the Party.

7439 Q. Mr. Meyer, during your membership in the Communist Party of the United States, were any of the members of the Party sent to Russia to school?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q. Do you recall the names of any of the persons who were sent to Russia to school? A. Morris Childs had been to school in Russia.

7442 Q. Do you recall the names of any other members of the Communist Party in Chicago that attended a Communist Party school in the Soviet Union? A. Ray Hansborough.

Q. How did you gain that information? A. From conversations with him about the school.

Q. Mr. Meyer, during your membership in the Communist Party were members of the Party open members of the Party or concealed members of the Party? A. They were both.

7443 Q. Were any particular groups of the Communist Party retained as concealed members of the Party? A. Apart from the individuals, who might be for special reasons in the individual case, the groupings that were usually so concealed were trade unionists, mass organization leaders, professionals, people whose value to the Party or personal careers might be seriously interfered with by being known as open members.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: How did they conceal it? How did you know they were concealing it? They were concealed from whom? Were they concealed from you?

THE WITNESS: No, sir. There were some who were concealed from me unquestionably who were members at large. Even though I was one of the top people in the district, there were members that I only knew of as existing without knowing who they were. These were a very few. Others, let us say, a group of professionals, would be known to each other and to the section organizer of that section and to leading people from the district who had activities to do with them, but their membership otherwise would not be known either to other Party members or to the

7444 public. Others might simply take precautions in some mass organization they were working with or in some place of employment and be fairly open elsewhere. There was a whole gradation of degrees of secrecy, including some members at large whose names I knew of. For example, when I was membership director, in answer to that last question, I received dues for about 35 members at large or 15 members at large, something of that sort, 15 or 20 of

those I never knew who they were. I never knew what their identity was. They were solely in touch with the district organizer or perhaps some other leading member. This was the extreme concealment that I spoke of.

By Mr. STORY:

Q. What do you mean by an open member of the Party?

A. An open member of the Party would be a member who in no way or nowhere concealed his identity as a Party member, and acted as a Communist at all times, and admitted the fact or was proud of the fact. I was an open member, for example. I never concealed it.

Q. Mr. Meyer, during your association with the Communist Party were members given any instruction concerning the disclosure of their membership to police or other governmental officials.

Mr. ABT: I object.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE: From your own personal knowledge tell us what you know about it. The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Certainly members were all indoctrinated not to cooperate in any way with law enforcement authorities on that question. That is, if they were going to a demonstration they were instructed, if arrested, not to admit they were members of the Communist Party. Others who were in special situations where they were not supposed to be members of the Communist Party by law or by custom, were certainly instructed not to admit the fact, and so on.

By Mr. STORY:

Q. During what period of time in the Communist Party was this true? A. To a greater or less degree throughout my experience in the Communist Party, varying from time to time in quantity and number.

Q. You were a member of the Communist Party of the United States during what period? A. From 1934 until I went into the Army, and again upon being out of the Army until the dissolution of the Party and the establishment of

the CPA, and then technically a member of the Party as late as January 1945.

Q. In 1945— A. In 1945 I was technically a member. For practical purposes I was considered a member until the explosion. It just so happens that I was so torn by doubts that I didn't re-register and nobody noticed it in 7446 January 1945. But I was associated with the Party up through practically January 1946.

Q. Did the Communist Party of the United States keep any records during your association with the Party? A. What sort of records?

Q. Any kind of records. A. The financial records which were kept by the District Organization and by certain organizations like the Workers' School, the framework of records, let us say. They contained no important transactions. They were simply legal records for tax authorities and public view.

Q. Were any other records kept by the Communist Party during your membership? A. In the normal sense of the word I would say no membership records, for example. There were ways of knowing how many members there were in sections, units, and so on. I wouldn't call them records. That is to say, a district or section membership director would have a chart—I was district membership director, so I would have a chart—which divided each district into sections and I would know the number in each section. In turn the sections would be divided into branches and I would know the number in each branch. The section membership director would have a pretty good idea of the names of those in the most important branches. Particularly in the period 1939 to 1941 they were strictly forbidden to 7447 keep them in written form. They might be identified in some form of mnemonic (sic) initial or nickname or something like that, and so on, down to the bottom, where the branch membership director was strictly instructed to keep them in his head and in his head only. So in the strict sense of the word they were not records.

Q. Were you given any instructions while you were membership director to keep your records by this method?

A. Yes, sir; because I was membership director during this period of extreme precaution, and both these and other precautions were general. The actual methods I used I may have worked out for myself, but the instructions were to the effect of no identifiable lists of names, records of that sort, and so on.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: From whom did you receive these instructions?

THE WITNESS: The district organizer.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Verbally?

THE WITNESS: Verbally.

By MR. STORY:

Q. How were finance transactions recorded during this period? A. Those that could be—

MR. ABT: May we have the period? I am not clear what period we are talking about.

7448 MR. LAFOLLETTE: You are talking about the period during which he was a membership director.

MR. STORY: That is right.

MR. ABT: The entire period of membership?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: The period during which he was a membership director in Chicago, as I understand.

THE WITNESS: The expenses such as rent, salaries of known Party leaders, and so forth, some of them at any rate, were passed through the books in ordinary check form. That is to say, transactions about which there was no desire to maintain any secrecy. All other transactions were in cash.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: How did you pay the rent?

THE WITNESS: I think we probably paid it in check. I am certain that that general type of thing was paid by check. The rent would be paid by check because it was an office building.

By MR. STORY:

Q. How often were membership books issued by the Communist Party? A. Every year, so far as I can remember.

Q. Were membership books issued for all the years that you were a member of the Communist Party? A. I think for every year with the exception of 1940 or 1941, one of those years when the Party felt it was facing illegality and books were not issued at all. It was either 1940 or '41.

7449 Q. Were you present at any meetings when the reasons for not issuing books were discussed? A. Certainly at meeting of the organizational and educational commission, which was the operative organ of the Chicago District when a number of problems were taken up with regard to the Party's fear of approaching illegality, that was one of the questions discussed.

Q. Were any reasons given for not issuing membership books?

THE WITNESS: To protect the members.

By MR. STORY:

Q. To protect them from what? A. From any consequences that might ensue from what the Communist called an attack on the Party. To keep the apparatus of the Party in such shape that it could function even if the Party were illegal.

7450 Q. Mr. Meyer, were any members of the Communist Party identified by aliases or party names during your membership in the Party? A. Certainly a number of leading party members' names were not those they were born with, and—we were talking of records before—real names were never used in records and very rarely used in Party books. In Party books some alias was put in for a great many, if not most Party members.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: How about Childs?

THE WITNESS: I don't really know whether Morris Childs' name was on it or not. I do not believe it is, but I don't know.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: So far as you know, he has never used any alias other than Morris Childs?

THE WITNESS: No, sir. So far as I know.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: As long as you knew him he used the name of Childs?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: All right.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Were all members of the Communist Party allowed possession of their membership book? A. In the professional units that I had to do with, the professional section in Chicago, the books were usually kept en masse for all members of the unit by the unit financial secretary.

7451 Q. Was this during the period that you were membership director? A. Yes, sir; and also during the period I was educational director this was the custom in most of the professional units, if not all.

Q. Why did you use this system in the Communist Party during the time you were a membership director? A. This question of keeping the books together?

Q. Yes. A. Essentially because they were members who did not admit their Party membership, who were concealed members, who didn't want to have anything around the house, whatever to prove that they were members. Hence, by not having their books there was one more possibility of exposure removed.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: But the person who did keep the books had them all?

THE WITNESS: He kept them in some safe place, 7452 presumably.

MR. MARCANTONIO: I didn't get the last question by the Chairman and the last answer.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I said the member who did keep the books had them all, the books of the people who were concealed. The witness' testimony, Mr. Marcantonio, has been

that a section leader or professional or concealed member would keep all the books.

THE WITNESS: Usually the unit financial secretary.

MR. MARCANTONIO: What books did he keep, the membership books?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: The membership books.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Mr. Meyer, when new membership books were issued what happened to the old books, if you know? A. During the time that I was a member they were collected. The old book was taken back, and the member was re-registered and the new book given out.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Were there any numbers on the book?

THE WITNESS: I think the books were numbered. Yes, they were specifically, and checked one against the other, at least in the year in which I was doing the job.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Mr. Meyer, during your association with the Communist Party in Chicago did you at any time have an office in the District Headquarters? A. During the entire time I was a full time functionary, I had an office there.

Q. What were the dates? A. From early 1938 to summer of 1942.

Q. Were any steps taken to conceal the activities of the Communist Party in and around the district office?

THE WITNESS: A number of steps were routinely and more or less thoroughly carried out. It was against all policy to use the Party telephone. The formulation was not to use the Party telephone for any conversation that you would not like for a member of the FBI to overhear. As a matter of fact, that telephone instruction was carried a bit further. It was not regarded as wise to use any of the phone booths in the immediate neighborhood of the Party office or to make

more than two or three or four phone calls from the same booth.

7454 THE WITNESS: Further, nothing but mimeographed documents, no letters or detailed information or names were to be left in Party desk drawers overnight, nothing but books or materials that existed in sufficient quantity to be widely circulated anyway. It was also the habit not to mention anyone's name who was not an open Communist aloud in the Party office. All leading meetings or most of them at any rate of the small committees were held outside of the Party offices in private homes, especially arranged for in advance.

By MR. STORY:—

Q. Mr. Meyer, how was important Communist Party mail handled during your membership in the Party? A. It wasn't sent out. I know only from my own experience. I never organized such an apparatus. It was handed to the person in charge of the office who disposed of it through special addresses, cover addresses to wherever it had to go. That is to say, the addresses of private individuals who were not suspect, to which it was sent, and mail to the Party district office in turn came the same way.

7455 Q. Have you taught anything as to what other members of the Communist Party should do in the event they were called upon to testify? A. The total understanding—

MR. ABT: Just a moment. I object. The witness was asked whether he ever taught anything. He can answer that yes or no.

THE WITNESS: I misunderstood the question, I am sorry. Yes, I did teach.

MR. LAFOUILLETTE: All right, what did you teach?

THE WITNESS: I taught essentially this—

MR. ABT: When and where, Mr. Chairman.

THE WITNESS: I taught over a long period of time in Party schools, in Party unit meetings where such questions had arisen, this doctrine: That there is no moral law for a Communist Party member except the success of that to which he has dedicated himself, that is to say, the classless society, which in turn means—this is what I taught—

THE WITNESS: That the basis of all moral acts by a Communist is the question, do they or do they not help to achieve the victory of the classless society, which in turn
7457 comes down to and means, do they or do they not help the Communist Party? Therefore, no oath, no statement in court, no consideration of any kind can come before the question of whether it helps or hurts the Party. Therefore, of course they were to testify or to make affidavit or whatever it may be in accordance with the needs of the Party at that time and irrespective of the actual truth.

By MR. STORY:

Q. Mr. Meyer, was the membership of important committees of the Communist Party reduced at any time during your association with the Communist Party? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were these committees reduced? A. In the period between 1939 and 1941 when other steps for security were being taken.

Q. What committees were reduced in size? A. The National Committee, the State Committee, and some of the section committees.

Q. Were you present at any meetings of the Communist Party when the reasons for this reduction in size was discussed? A. The same meetings I referred to previously, in which the whole question of preparations to safeguard the Party were taken up, and the reasons given were to
7458 safeguard the Party.

Q. Did the number of members allowed in small units of the Party change at any time during your membership in the Party? A. On a number of occasions during my

membership. When I first came to the United States the average basic unit ran from 12 to 20, never very much larger. In the period around 1936 a number of these were combined in the neighborhood or large industrial branches, which ran anywhere from 50 to 100. Then again in 1939 to 1941 that I was speaking of these were broken up into groups of five or six. Then again after the Hitler attack on Russia and the general change of political climate they were enlarged again to their older form.

Q. Were you the membership director at the time the basic unit of the Party was reduced in size? A. I don't believe so. I think that occurred just before I became membership director.

7459 Q. Mr. Meyer, did you attend any meetings at any time of the Communist Party where plans were devised to take the Communist Party underground? A. I attended meetings of the group, the meetings I spoke of a little earlier, where among other security measures we discussed preparing for actual illegality as well as in preparatory stages, yes, sir.

Q. What plans were made at the meetings that you attended?

7460 THE WITNESS: Apart from the steps I have already spoken of which have some relevance to this question, the ones I was concerned with were preparations of stocks of mimeograph paper, ink, mimeograph machines at different places, packets of books and study outlines to be prepared and put away and scattered about the district. This type of thing in connection with the agitation and propaganda apparatus. In every section we got a large good mimeograph machine and for every branch we were supposed to get some form of duplicator of one kind or another. There was a scattering of study outlines and a collection of basic books where they could be called upon and available. Steps were taken whereby leaders down in the

subsection or branch levels were prepared for these alternate places of living and alternate leaders with whom contact could be made. The actual immediate step was taken, even at that time, of transforming the connections of the district organization with the sections and sub-sections immediately by giving up the process of having regular meetings of the section organizers, the sectional directors and the section membership directors which used to be held weekly on a district basis, and assigning to each member of the Central District core a small area, a third or a quarter of what had been the section, with a new section organizer, through whom he was to receive and transmit all directives. So instead of a network coming out of five or six lines of communication, all communication between district
7461 divisions and the subsections and branches were to go through one source which then spread it out through the smaller branches being set up.

7464 Q. During this period what was taught in Communist Party schools concerning the allegiance that members of the Communist Party of the United States owed to the Government of the United States?

THE WITNESS: The doctrine that seems to me touched most clearly and directly on this was the doctrine that the Soviet Union represented the first workers breach through the walls of capitalism, had become therefore a fortress for the international revolutionary movement, one whose loss would be irreparable, so that the defense and protection and expansion of that fortress was the first task
7465 of the revolutionary movement and the Communist movement under any and all circumstances.

7466 Q. Mr. Meyer, do you recall an article written by Jacques Duclos, a French Communist, concerning the Communist Party of the United States? A. Very well, sir.

7467 Q. Did you read the Duclos article in Political Affairs? A. Not for the first time, but I read it in there, studied it in there. I have seen it elsewhere.

7468 Q. Did you hold any position in the Communist Party of the United States at the time that article was first published? A. I was teacher at the Jefferson School, writing for the New Masses.

Q. Did you attend any Communist Party meetings or conferences at which this article was discussed? A. On a couple of occasions, yes.

7469 Q. Did the National Board, Executive Board of the Communist Party take any action concerning the Duclos article? A. Its first resolution on the question appeared a day or so after this meeting, I believe on Sunday or Monday, in either the Sunday Worker or the 7470 Worker, and it was a resolution which passed the Board with Browder opposed and I think Hudson not voting, which supported the Duclos position.

Q. After these resolutions had been passed by the National Board did you attend any other meetings where the Duclos article was discussed? A. Another meeting called together at the Jefferson School, of the faculty members, probably about a week or ten days after the first one.

Q. Who was the principal speaker at the second meeting? A. Jack Stachel.

Q. Approximately how many faculty members were present at this meeting? A. Maybe a few more than the previous time, the same rough amount.

Q. What did Jack Stachel say concerning the Duclos article at this second meeting? A. Jack Stachel said that he was sure that those present had had time to consider the question since the rather hastily convened meeting at which it was first discussed there and could realize now, after the

first flush of upsetness, what the real situation was and that therefore the real question to be discussed was how did the American Communist Party ever get into such a slough of revisionism and liquidationism. He proceeded to analyze

the reasons for it back to the days of Mr. Lovestone 7471 and to say that the whole thinking of the American

Party had been vitiated, that this arose particularly during the Roosevelt period, that one of the most important things that the Party had to do in pulling itself out of its liquidationism was to kill the Roosevelt myth; that the problem was one of thoroughly revising the Party's thinking and activities and profiting by them in the light of Marxism-Leninism to carry out a ruthless campaign, et cetera, against revisionism and liquidationism, and to pull itself together as fast as possible because the disease had gone so far that already, he said, in the South not only the Party but many other Communist organizations had been liquidated and it would be carried further in that direction and so on. But the peroration essentially had to do with the need of liquidating liquidationism, liquidating revisionism, and returning to the fountains of Marxism-Leninism.

Q. Did any one present at the second faculty meeting defend Earl Browder and his position? A. I did. I don't think anyone else did.

Q. Did Stachel answer your position on the Duclos article? A. Yes. I had made the center of my rather short statement that there was every possibility of progressive development in friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union and through peaceful development.

7472 At the same time I retained a socialist position. I

spoke in terms of the possibility of the development of Socialism, and so on, without any need of sharp struggle. I said that in view of the fact that this was possible and that there remained only two great powers in the world, that the policy of the Duclos letter was a policy of war between the United States and the Soviet Union and was an extremely dangerous one for the American Communist Party

and for the American people. He answered it by saying that I was provocative, and revisionist and liquidationist. He answered me with words, with attacks, but I don't remember the substance of his answer or whether there was any.

7483 Dr. Philip E. Mosely recalled as a witness on behalf of Petitioner, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION—resumed

By MR. LENVIN:

7486 Q. I would like to show Dr. Mosely what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.

298—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 298.)

Q.—which is an issue of The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Volume II, No. 46, for December 30, 1950, and specifically direct his attention to an article appearing on page 8 which is a translation of an article entitled "Peking Honors Heroes," by Pravda Staff correspondent I. Vysovok, which appeared in Pravda for December 8, and ask Dr. Mosely whether in arriving at his opinion regarding the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the entrance of the Chinese Communists into the Korean conflict he took this article into consideration. A. I read this article at the time, shortly after it was published in Pravda, and I have also read it in the condensed version presented in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press. In my opinion this article

7487 expresses strong Soviet approval for the participation of what it describes as the Chinese people in the military struggles in Korea.

This is only one of many news items and editorial opinions of the time in the Soviet Press similarly supporting the role of Chinese forces in Korea from November 1950 on.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 299—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 299.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q.—which is an issue of The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for December 2, 1950, Volume II, No. 42, and direct your attention to an article appearing on Page 16 entitled "Chinese volunteers on their way to Korea," also by I. Vysokov, which is a summary translation of an article appearing in Pravda for November 13, and ask you whether you took this article into consideration in arriving at your opinion toward the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the entrance of the Chinese forces into the Korean conflict.

A. Yes, I read this article in full at the time and also in this summary translation published in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Published approximately two weeks before the formal entrance of Chinese Communist forces into the military struggle in Korea, it announced that tens of thousands of Chinese volunteers were entering the 7488 Korean People's Army, the Army of Northern Korea, to take part in the struggle against what it described as American imperialism. The correspondent expressed enthusiastic approval of these steps, and Pravda published this news story, which is similar to many others at that time in the Soviet Press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a matter of historical fact, is it not, that a clergyman by the name of Cardinal Mindszenty was charged with and put on trial for treasonable activities by the Hungarian Government early in 1939?

7489 THE WITNESS: The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and his co-defendants took place in February 1949 in Budapest.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. From your examination of publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of the Soviet Government or the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were toward the charges leveled against Cardinal Mindszenty? A. Through its newspapers and other official statements by its spokesmen the Soviet Government expressed its complete approval of both the charges which were brought against Cardinal Mindszenty and his co-defendants, defended fully the procedures which were applied in conducting the trial and the sentences which were imposed and which were reported to have been executed.

7490 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 300—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 300.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. —which is a statement made by Mr. Gromyko at the 201st plenary meeting of the General Assembly held at New York on Friday the 29th of April 1949, and ask you whether you have ever read that statement before. A. Yes, I have read this statement at the time—

7491 THE WITNESS: I also re-read this account of Mr. Gromyko's remarks since then.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. In your opinion does this statement reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Cardinal Mindszenty case. A. Yes, in my opinion it does. Mr. Gromyko was speaking officially on behalf of his government in the General Assembly of the United Nations. His remarks are given in the third person, but according to the practice of the United Nations secretariat the Soviet delegation had

an adequate opportunity to present any corrections that it wished to before the official record was issued. In his remarks Mr. Gromyko expressed complete approval of the charges which had been brought against Cardinal Mindszenty and his co-defendants. He gave his complete approval to the substance of the charges. He approved the methods by which the trial had been conducted, and he rejected outright all criticisms, both concerning the substance and the procedure of the trial.

By MR. LENVIN:

7493 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 301—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 301.)

Q. —an issue of Soviet Press Translations, Volume IV, No. 5, dated March 1, 1949, and direct your attention to the translation of an article entitled "The Vatican Suffers a Defeat," by A. Berezov, which appeared in the Literaturnaya Gazeta for January 15, 1949, and ask you, Dr. Mosely, whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article in the original Russian newspaper, the Literary Gazette, and also in the full translation published in the Soviet Press Translations.

7494 Q. In your opinion, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Cardinal Mindszenty case? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is only one of many expressions at that time and since of the complete support of the Soviet Press and spokesmen for the charges brought against Cardinal Mindszenty and his co-defendants and even adds many further charges against the Holy See. It is a typical expression of Soviet view of this trial.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 302—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 302.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is New Times for February 16, 1949, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 22 entitled "Cardinal Mindszenty's Trial," by F. Potyomkin, and ask you if you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article in the Russian version of New Times shortly after it was issued and I have also read it in the English version of New Times.

Q. In your opinion is that article typical and does it reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Cardinal Mindszenty case? A. Yes, in my opinion it is one additional example of the attitude continuously taken by the 7495 Soviet press and spokesmen on the question of both the content and procedure of the trial as well as its attacks upon the Catholic Church as a whole and upon the Holy See.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other material issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the charges leveled against Cardinal Mindszenty and the subsequent trial? A. Yes, I have. The press of the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently before, during, and after the trial.

Q. Now I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 303—

Q. Which is an excerpt from a book by William Z. Foster entitled "The Twilight of World Capitalism," copyright 1949, by International Publishers Company, Inc., and direct your attention to an excerpt commencing with the 7496 first paragraph on page 95 and ending with the last full paragraph on page 98, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read the entire volume

by Mr. Foster, including the section presented here. This would be regarded as an authoritative statement of the point of view of the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States, and as such it was frequently recommended in the Party Press for study and thought.

7497 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 304—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 304.)

By Mr. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for February 10, 1949, and direct your attention to an editorial appearing on page 1 entitled "Mindszenty—Jew Hater" and ask you if you have ever read that editorial before. A. Yes, I have read this editorial.

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the view and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Cardinal Mindszenty case as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does, and it is a typical expression by the Press of the Communist Party of the United States concerning the nature of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. It ignores completely the fact that the postwar Hungarian Government, in which the Hungarian Communist Party played a leading part, publicly thanked Cardinal Mindszenty for his great efforts to save from destruction many hundreds of thousands of Jewish people both in Hungary and those who had taken refuge in Hungary from Nazi barbarism.

7499 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 305—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 305.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Sunday Worker for February 13, 1949, and direct your attention to page 3, an article by Robert Friedman entitled "The Truth about the Mindszenty Case."

I ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

A. Yes, I read this article at the time and since. In my opinion it is directly parallel to the point of view on this problem which was taken by the Hungarian Communist Government and by the Soviet Government through their official statements and their controlled press.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been
7500 marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.
306—

(The document referred to was marked for identification
Petitioner's Exhibit No. 306.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for February 15, 1949, and direct your attention to the editorial entitled "The Vatican Talks Politics," and ask you whether you have ever read that before.

MR. LaFOLLETTE: Is this on the same subparagraph?

MR. LENVIN: Yes.

MR. LaFOLLETTE: All right.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this editorial in the Daily Worker for February 15, 1949.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the view and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Mindszenty case as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It expresses the complete approval of the Communist Party of the United States of the conduct of the trial in Hungary, its full support of the conclusions of the Hungarian Court, and of the sentence imposed, and also broadens this matter

to a general attack upon the whole position and doctrine of the Catholic Church. It is directly parallel to similar expressions of views and advocacy of the policy as found 7501 in the Soviet Press at that time and since.

Q: Now, Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 307—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 307.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for February 7, 1949, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 1 entitled "Spellman Defends Mindszenty's Treasonous Acts," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this front page article in the Daily Worker for February 7, 1949.

Q. In your opinion does that Article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Mindszenty case? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is printed in a prominent position in the official organ of the Party. Its accusations and allegations are directly parallel to those presented at about the same time in the Soviet Press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a matter of historical fact, is it not, that the Government of Bulgaria in early 1947 put on trial a man by the name of Nicola Petkov? A. Yes, it is a fact. The trial occurred in August 1947.

7503 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I recall the principal charges clearly. I read the full indictment and also the full text of the record of the trial as issued by the Bulgarian Government. I have also read the summary reports issued in the Soviet Press.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Proceed.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. Will you answer the question, then, Dr. Mosely, as to what the charges were, what he was charged with? A. Yes. The principal—

7504 THE WITNESS: The principal charge was that of treason against the Communist Government of Bulgaria. That embraced other charges such as sabotage, espionage, conspiracy to overthrow the regime in Bulgaria and conspiracy with representatives of foreign powers. It also included charges of hostility against the Soviet Union and attempts to weaken the so-called friendly relations between Bulgaria under its communist leadership and the Soviet Union. Petkov had been a member of the coalition government which welcomed Soviet forces to Bulgaria as liberators from Nazi control, and he had for many months remained an active participant in that coalition government.

THE WITNESS: He was prior to his arrest the leader of the Bulgarian Peasant Party, which had been in opposition for many years to authoritarian rule in Bulgaria and had striven for a democratic development of the country.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked
7505 as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 308—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 308.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. —which is an issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for December 15, 1947, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 2, by V. Chervenkov, entitled "The Activities of the Bulgarian Worker's Party (Communists)". I ask you if you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article

published in For a Lasting Peace of December 15, 1947, at the time and since. In it the secretary-general of the Communist Party of Bulgaria describes the complete defeat of Petkov and the elimination of his party. He defends fully the substance of the charges and the procedures under which Petkov was convicted and executed by the Bulgarian Communist Government.

7506 Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Cominform and of the Soviet Union toward the charges brought against Petkov? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is a report delivered by Mr. Chervenkov at a conference of the Communist Information Bureau at which he was the representative of his party. This represents a summary of the main points of the position taken by the Bulgarian Communist Government and Party in the Petkov case, and it is directly parallel to the position taken by the Soviet Press and by the World Communists in the same matter and at that general time.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 309—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 309.)

By MR. LEVIN:

Q. —which is a certified translation of an article appearing in Red Star, central organ of the Ministry of Armed Forces of the Union of the SSR, and direct your
7507 attention to an article which appears on page 4 entitled "Criminals Unmasked and Justly Punished," signed "The Observer," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the charges brought against Petkov? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It appeared in an official organ of a Ministry of the Government of the USSR, and it expressed complete approval of

the substance of the charges brought against Petkov and his co-defendants and expressed approval of the procedures under which the trial was conducted and the sentence executed, and it expressed very strong criticism of efforts by other governments to try to influence this procedure. It is typical of many expressions at the time which appeared in the various organs of the Soviet Press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 310, which is the Daily Worker for Saturday August 9, 1947, and direct your attention to the article appearing on page 2 headed "Bulgar Oppositionist Was Offered U.S. Aid"; and also direct your attention to what has been marked as Petitioner's No. 311 and the article on page 2 entitled "Bulgaria Asks Death for Fascist Conspirator."

Q. Is the Daily Worker for August 13, 1947; and what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 312, which is the Daily Worker for September 24, 1947, and the article appearing on page 2 entitled "Petkov Hung as Traitor."

(The documents referred to were marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibits No. 310, 311 and 312.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I ask you whether you have ever read those three articles before.

Q. Have you read those three items before, Dr. Mosely?
A. Yes, I have.

Q. In your opinion do those items reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Petkov case? A. Yes, in my opinion they do. In summary form they support the charges brought by the Bulgarian Communist Government against the defendant and

his co-defendants and parallel the line taken by the Soviet press on that same issue.

7522 Q. I think we had a question pending to the effect of whether or not it was a historical fact that during the past year the United States had made efforts to draft and reach an agreement with other countries on a peace treaty with Japan, and in fact that such a peace treaty was signed at San Francisco very recently. A. Yes, this is a fact. The peace treaty was signed by representatives of 48 governments—

7523 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other material emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion regarding the views and attitude of the Soviet Union regarding this proposed peace treaty with Japan? A. Yes, I have. Through official statements of representatives of the Soviet Union and through comment to the Soviet Press, the Soviet Government repeatedly expressed its opinion both of the procedures by which the treaty was negotiated and the substance of the provisions of the treaty.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 314, which is our M-148—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 314.)

By Mr. LENVIN:

Q. —which is The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for June 16, 1951, and direct your attention to an article entitled "Soviet Remarks on Peace Treaty with Japan," complete text of an article appearing both in Pravda and Izvestia for May 23, Page 2, and which is the text of a document handed to Mr. A. Kirk, United States Ambassador to the USSR by A. E. Bogomolov, USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and ask you whether you have
7524 ever read those remarks before. A. Yes. On the day

following I read the substantial excerpt which appeared in the New York Times. When the text of Pravda arrived I read it in full in Russian, and I have also read the English translation presented as a complete text in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for June 16, 1951. This is an official document of the Soviet Government.

Q. In your opinion do these remarks reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the proposed Japanese treaty? A. Yes, in my opinion they do. They comment on most of the points of the treaty concerning which the Soviet Government has at any time expressed an interest or concern, and it comments on the procedure which had been followed up until that time and proposed for future adoption in completing the treaty, and presented alternative proposals both for procedure and for the substance of the treaty.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 315—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 315.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for September 1, 1951, and direct your attention to an article appearing on page 6 which is a translation of an article appearing in Pravda for July 16, 1951, entitled "Separate Treaty with Japan is Instrument of American Aggression," and ask you whether you have ever read that before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this condensed translation of the article by Mr. Markov in Pravda, July 16, 1951, as presented in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for September 1, 1951. It is in my opinion an authoritative statement of the point of view of the Soviet Government on both the procedure and the substance of the proposed treaty with Japan. It accuses the United States of numerous vio-

lations of agreements, of preparing an aggressive war against the Soviet Union, of enslaving Japan and numerous other allegations.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitudes of that Party toward the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty? A. Yes, I have. The official press of the Communist Party of 7526 the United States commented frequently on the course of negotiations for the treaty of peace with Japan. It has directly paralleled the accusations made in the Soviet Press, and it has called upon the United States to adopt the position taken by the Soviet Government in this matter.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 316—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 316.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q.—which is the Daily Worker for August 23, 1951, and direct your attention to an editorial entitled "Japan and Peace in Asia," which appears on page 5, and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before. A. Yes, I have read this editorial of the Daily Worker of August 23, 1951.

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the proposed peace treaty with Japan? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It repeats in summary form several of the principal accusations made against the policy followed by the United States in this matter, and its treatment of the problem and its recommendations are directly parallel to those presented by the Soviet Press.

(Off the record)

7527

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 317—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 317.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Sunday Worker for May 13, 1951, and ~~direct your~~ attention to an article entitled "Government Seeks to Hold Japan as Colony," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the proposed Japanese Treaty as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It repeats in summary form the accusations made in the Soviet Press concerning the procedure and substance of the treaty and recommends full support of the position proposed by the Soviet Government in this matter. Its position is in its main points directly parallel to that taken by the Soviet Government and the Soviet Press in this matter.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a matter of historical fact, is it not, that a man by the name of William Oatis was imprisoned in Czechoslovakia—

7528 THE WITNESS: This matter has been widely reported in the Press of different countries and has been the subject of official exchanges of documents which also have been published as between the Government of the United States and the Government of Czechoslovakia.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your examination of publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the

Soviet Union toward the imprisonment of Oatis? A. Yes. I have. The Soviet Press gave its full support to the position taken by the authorities in Czechoslovakia in arresting, imprisoning and trying and sentencing William Oatis. The Soviet Press expressed full approval and support both of the substance of the charges and the procedures by which this American correspondent was arrested, held in prison and then tried and sentenced.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked 7529 as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 318—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 318.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for August 18, 1951, and direct your attention to a translation of an article which appeared in Pravda for July 5, by A. Bohrovsky, entitled "American Spy in Role of Journalist," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this in the original as published in Pravda a few days after it appeared in Moscow, and I also read a somewhat condensed text which appeared in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press under date of August 18, 1951. It is, in my opinion a forthright support of the action taken by the Czechoslovak government and an outright rejection of the protests which had been made in the free world press as well.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the view and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the imprisonment of Oatis? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It appeared in the official party newspaper, Pravda.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that Party was toward the imprisonment of Oatis? A. Yes, I have. The Press of the Communist Party of the United States supported fully the

charges brought by the Czechoslovak Communist Government and approved fully the procedures applied in the arrest, imprisonment, trial, and sentencing and punishment of William Oatis, and rejected completely all protests made by the United States Government in the defense of a citizen and in defense of freedom of transmission of news in this case.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 319—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 319.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for July 4, 1951, and direct your attention to an editorial appearing on page 5 headed "A Reporter Should be a Reporter," and ask you whether you took that editorial into consideration in arriving at your opinion as to the view and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Oatis case.

A. Yes, I did. In this official publication of the Communist Party of the United States there is a brief but sweeping approval of both the substance of the charges and the procedure employed in convicting William Oatis. There is a rejection of efforts of governments, individuals and groups outside the Communist-controlled areas of the world to protest against or modify the results of these actions of the Czechoslovak Communist government.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a historical fact, is it not, that the Soviet Union, or more specifically one of the spokesmen of the Soviet Union, made a speech in which there was contained proposals for possible peace settlement or armistice in Korea some time around the end of June 1951?

THE WITNESS: Yes. According to my recollection this occurred on June 23, 1951. Mr. Malik, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, in a radio address sponsored by the United Nations Organization, suggested that it was

time to undertake negotiations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and to open the way for a longer range settlement of the problems in Korea. Mr. Malik, as a Deputy Foreign Minister and at that time permanent delegate of his government to the United Nations, was in my opinion speaking in his official capacity as the representative of his government.

(Off the record)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 320—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 320.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is The Current Digest of the Soviet Press for July 7, 1951, and specifically direct your attention to page 12 which contains a translation of an article appearing in Pravda for June 26 by M. Kharlamov, entitled "For a Peaceful Solution of the Korean Conflict," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Kharlamov in Pravda, June 26, in Russian, and I have also read what purports to be the complete translation appearing in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press for July 17, 1951.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that Party were toward the Soviet Peace proposals in Korea? A. Yes, I have. The official press of the Communist Party of the United States has commented frequently on the initial proposal of June 23, 1951, and on the subsequent course of negotiations and non-negotiations.

• Q. Now, I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 321—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 321.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q.—which is the Sunday Worker for July 1, 1951, and direct your attention to an article appearing on page 3 entitled "World Hails Bid for Cease-Fire in Korea," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article in the Sunday Worker for July 1, 1951.

Q. In your opinion does that article fairly reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Soviet Peace proposals? A. Yes, in my opinion it is a typical expression of the views of the Communist Party of the United States. It places the entire blame for the struggle in Korea upon the alleged aggression of the United States and defends the participation of the so-called People's Republic of China in that struggle, and it supports the position taken by the Soviet Government and the Soviet Press in this issue. It also urges that the United States Government adopt the position advanced by the Soviet Government. In my opinion it supports and is directly parallel to the position adopted by the Soviet Government and expressed by that government directly through official statements and through the Soviet Press.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 322—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 322.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q.—which is the Daily Worker for July 2, 1951, and direct your attention to the editorial appearing on page 5 entitled "Korea's Lessons" and ask you whether in arriving at your opinion as to the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Soviet peace

proposals you took that editorial into consideration. A. Yes, I did. This official statement of views of the authorized organ of the Communist Party of the United States places again all blame for the military struggle on the alleged aggression of the United States, its desire allegedly to destroy China and to conquer the world. It finds good only in the so-called peace policy of the Soviet Union and urges that the Soviet policy be adopted by the United States. In my opinion it is directly parallel to the Soviet policy on this question.

Q. Finally, Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 323—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 323.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for July 17, 1951, and direct your attention to an article appearing on page 1 entitled "Communist Party asks People Unite for Korea Armistice and World Peace," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this statement of the Communist Party of the United States and the article in which it is embodied.

Q. In your opinion does this article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Korean peace proposal as of that date. A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It blames the Government of the United States and various circles in the United States for alleged delays in carrying on negotiations for an armistice and accuses them of desiring the continuation and expansion of the war and of threatening China. Its position on this question is directly in support of and parallel to the position and proposals advanced by the Soviet Government.

7538 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 324—

Q. —which is the issue of Moscow News for March 22, 1939, and direct your attention to page 24, which contains a-reprint of note of M. M. Litvinov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, of March 18, to the German Ambassador, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this note of former Commissar Litvinov of March 18, 1939. I read it in the New York Times on the day following its issuance in Moscow, and I have studied it several times in Russian as well as reading this authorized English translation published in the English language newspaper issued in Moscow at that time.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that note fairly reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward Nazi Germany as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does: It is an official statement of the authorized spokesman of the Soviet Government on foreign policy, and it denounces the recent actions of the German Government as arbitrary, violent and aggressive and states that Germany has created the danger to peace through its aggressions.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 325—

Q. —which is the Moscow News for March 27, 1939, and direct your attention to an article on page 14 entitled "Britain and France Face Two Alternatives," by Politicus, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read this shortly after it was issued in Moscow, and I have read it since.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward Nazi Germany as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It states that there could no longer be any doubt but that Germany aims to dominate Europe and perhaps the entire world, and this view was expressed repeatedly by the Soviet spokesmen of that time and by the official press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 326—

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for August 18, 1939, and direct your attention to an editorial appearing on page 6 entitled "Again 'Danzig' Is Only a Fascist War Pretext," and ask you whether you have read that editorial before. A. Yes, I read it at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion does that editorial fairly reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward Nazi Germany as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is an editorial of the official organ of the Communist Party of the United States. It argues that Nazi expansion 7541 has no limits, that all nations which wish to remain at peace are endangered by Nazi expansion. It urges International cooperation to check this expansion. Its point of view, of which this is only one of many examples, in those months and years was directly parallel to the view expressed in the official organs of the Soviet Government at about that same time.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 327—

Q. —which is the Communist for May 1939, and direct your attention to an article entitled "May Day in the Struggle for Democracy and Peace," by I. Amter, and I ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward Nazi Germany prior to the Hitler-Soviet Pact? A. Yes, it does in my opinion. Mr. Amter was then a leading member of the Communist Party in the United States, writing in the official magazine of the Party. In his review of the World Situation for May Day 1939 he declared that the Fascist Axis powers were aiming at world domination. His analysis and views as expressed in this ar- 7542

ticle and on this topic in my opinion are directly parallel to those of the Soviet Government expressed through official Soviet spokesmen and the official Soviet Press.

7552 **Frank Straus Meyer** recalled as a witness for Petitioner, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION—resumed

7560 **MR. LAFOLLETTE:** Mr. Meyer, at the time that you were in charge of schools of the Respondent for the District in which you were the head, did you or did you not have any occasion to teach the students at the school what the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism and Leninism was?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir; definitely.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: During that time when you were in charge what did you teach?

MR. ART: I object.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: The objection is overruled. Proceed.

THE WITNESS: I taught that Marxism-Leninism, that is, the principles of scientific socialism—the phrase is in apposition—was the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and of the Communist International and the leaders of the Communist Parties, which is a body of—I think “doctrine” is probably not the word I used, but doctrine will do—a body of doctrine which is first a philosophy of

7561 history, secondly a guide on the basis of that philosophy of history to the leading party of the working class, that is to say, the Communist Party, in carrying out its historical role or mission, which is to overthrow the capitalist system and political states founded on the capitalist system, to destroy the economic organization on which that society is founded and its political system, to replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish socialism, which is to lead to the stage of Communism.

By MR. STORY:

7572 Q. Mr. Meyer, I hand you a book which purports to be the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has been marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 330, and ask you if you can identify the book.
A. This is the trade edition of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik).

Q. Is that the book which you have testified to on September 24, 1951, as being the central textbook of the Communist Party after it had been released in this country? A. That is the book.

Q. Has this book to your knowledge appeared in more than one edition? A. When it first appeared it appeared in an edition that was bound, as I remember it, in red cloth, which was the edition circulated through the Party and through Party outlets, the one of which a large number were sold, and this as I remember it was the trade edition, that is, the one sold in bookstores, released through ordinary
7573 book outlets and so on. It cost about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as much. There may have been later editions later but those are the two I know of.

Q. Did you use that trade edition in your educational work? A. Irrespective, one or the other. There is no difference in text as I know. They could be used interchangeably, the trade edition and the cheaper edition.

7601 MR. LAFOLLETTE: Mr. Meyer, while you were educational director in the district of which Chicago was
7602 the head, did you teach or cause to be taught in the classes which you conducted or caused to be conducted anything with reference to the preamble to the constitution which has been marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 328?

THE WITNESS: The 1938 constitution?

THE WITNESS: The 1938 constitution, yes, sir.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What, if anything, did you teach?

MR. ABT: May the record show a continuing objection?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Yes, it may, Mr. Abt.

THE WITNESS: That the guiding clause of the preamble, the decisive clause of the preamble, was the one which begins on the next to the last line on page 5, that is, "by the establishment of Socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International"; that that clause is the equivalent of the statement "in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism," which earlier today I defined.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Had you finished?

THE WITNESS: No, sir. And that therefore all other sections of the preamble are to be understood in the light of Marxism-Leninism, that is to say, that the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history and of the meaning of history and of its traditions is to be decisive. For example, that "carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence," is understood as meaning the central historically valid principles enunciated by these men and by the declaration, not the accidental class dress in which they were embodied at the time. Therefore, statements of Jefferson or of the Declaration which are in accord with the historical analysis of Marxism-Leninism are considered as being traditions which the Communist Party stands for; limited—speaking in terms of Marxism-Leninism—limited interpretations such as the defense of private property which are contained in much of the thinking of at least Jefferson and Lincoln in this respect, and of the Declaration of Independence, are to be considered as temporary class forms in which the basic fundamental principles are dressed.

Or, again, and in fact in this case a certain aspect of what I am about to say was pointed out directly, "defend the United States constitution against its reactionary enemies

who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties."

This was interpreted in the light of Lenin's teachings in the book "The Tactics of the Social Democracy," which is summarized in the History of the C.P.S.U., one of 7604 the earlier chapters, where it is made clear that the Communist Party, the Party of the working class, will support bourgeois democratic institutions against a more reactionary attack, which would make it less possible for the revolutionary movement to go forward, but will just as quickly destroy them when at a later time or at a different time these bourgeois democratic institutions stand in the way of the triumph of the proletarian revolution.

So it was advisedly—and this I know from the discussion at the convention at which I was present—it was advisedly that that sentence read "defend the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies." It does not say anything about defending the United States Constitution against the working class, against the proletarian revolutionary movement or anything of the sort. There is no comma there. It is a straight statement that it defend itself under these circumstances.

I won't go into further examples, but in general I will simply summarize by saying that any statement in this preamble which seems or appears to be in contradiction to the principles of Marxism-Leninism is by the guiding clause null and void, so to speak, and all sentences or phrases are to be understood in the light of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, that is, to be understood as in accord with the proletarian revolutionary theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, 7605 Stalin and the Communist International.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Is what you have just testified to something that you are relating to us or did you at any time teach it?

THE WITNESS: In substance I taught it.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Was your teaching of it known to any of your superiors in that district at the time you taught it?

THE WITNESS: In general it was known because the question of the use of the preamble of the constitution as the

center of the course on the Party, which was part of all full time training schools, was discussed with them in some detail.

7606

CROSS EXAMINATION

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

7661 Q. I am asking you, didn't you teach this line? Wasn't that the line at that time of the Communist Party that you taught?

Mr. LaFOLLETTE: Mr. Meyer, I will permit you to elaborate, but you were asked whether or not you were directed to teach and did teach in the manner in which Mr. Marcantonio asked you. It is whether you were directed so to teach.

THE WITNESS: Essentially I was directed to teach in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and as a higher educational authority on a given crux point that one came to, one utilized material as everyone else did along similar lines and in general agreement to, shall we say, reconcile statements with fundamental statements of Marxism-Leninism. In the school of which I am speaking, which is a closed party school on the district level, where I taught the purpose of the Party it was necessary to point out, to answer your question, in terms of Lenin's and Stalin's writings, that is to say, that the revolutionary transformation can not occur—this is the theory I taught—against the will of the majority, but the majority is only passive, and the defensive action of the leading vanguard of the proletariat is essential to achieve it. You can find this documented all through Lenin's works. Therefore I can't answer your question "yes" or "no," not against the majority certainly, but certainly not quite as you put it.

7662

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

Q. How about with the majority? A. An impossibility from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. The majority doesn't act.

Q. You said certainly not against the majority. A. Certainly not against the majority. That is the theory. I don't think any of that is fact. It is theory. I said the theory was.

Q. I am talking about the teaching, Mr. Witness. A. I am speaking of the teaching.

Q. You certainly did teach that they could not go against the majority? A. Yes, that the majority must be either neutralized or in general support.

Q. Or in support. A. In general support. Neutralized or in general support.

All this of course refers to the working class, the majority of the working class, and so on, whose definition in turn sometimes is wide and sometimes is narrow.

7668 Mary Stalcup Markward was called as a witness for Petitioner, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. TAYLOR:

7675 Q. While you were supplying the Federal Bureau of Investigation with information, Mrs. Markward, were you paid any salary by them? What sort of financial arrangements did you have with them? A. I was not paid a salary by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Nothing I did for my government was contingent upon receipt of any money from the Federal Bureau of Investigation or from any other government agency.

7676 Q. Did you receive any money from them at all? A. I did receive contributions to the expense of the work I was doing from time to time.

Q. What sort of things would they be? Make exactly clear just what sort of arrangements you had. A. In this type of activity I was doing, it was very necessary to pay dues, to

make contributions, to buy literature, that type of thing, and other incidental things.

Q. Transportation to Washington. A. Yes, that was part of it.

7698 Q. Were members of this government group either transferred into the District organization or transferred out of the District organization?

7699 THE WITNESS: In my position as membership secretary of the Communist Party of Washington, I had occasion to transfer Communist Party members into this government group. I had occasion to receive transfers from a person who had been in this group and who had left government employ and desired to become a member of the more open Party group.

I also at times acted as courier for whoever was handling the business of transfers within that group, and would give them to another person who had been responsible for membership in the District of Columbia, who gave them to me to transmit them to the District leadership. It was transfers of these people into and out of town, and to various parts of the country, to find their reliability and so forth as Communist Party members.

7706 Q. I believe you stated that after the city convention in 1945, the Communist Party in the city was broken down into trade union clubs. I don't recall whether you mentioned that any other clubs were in existence or not. Would you state whether or not there were any other clubs? A. There were other clubs. The trade union was the basic orientation of the Party. But the white collar clubs continued in existence, and two community clubs continued. They were smaller because the trade unions had been taken out. At a later date, a youth club was also formed at that time.

Q. Were these clubs referred to by any proper name?

A. During the period of organization of these clubs, we discussed organized laborers club, and a buildings trades club, and an A.F.L. club, but immediately subsequent to the time these organizations were established, the clubs were asked to assume names so that when we were discussing—for instance, the A.F.L. club would assume the name of William Z. Foster Club, and when we said that the William Z. Foster

Club had 20 members, we were not saying there were 7707 20 members in the A.F.L. club. The laborers club took the name of William Douglas Club, for the same reason. In other words, we would not say that there were five members who were laborers in the City of Washington. Almost all of the clubs did adopt names which would not immediately identify their membership.

Q. Do you know the names of any others? A. The Charles Krumbein Club. After the death of Charles Krumbein, who had been the national treasurer of the Communist Party, they took that name for their club.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What year was that, that they took the name?

THE WITNESS: I am not positive. Probably in 1947. I don't know.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You say probably in 1947?

THE WITNESS: I say probably in 1947. I am not completely sure.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Were any security measures taken? I am speaking of the time when the Party was reconstituted to the Communist Party of the United States.

7708 THE WITNESS: Immediately after the establishment of the many smaller Communist Party clubs in the city of Washington, when each club had its own membership list, and it was firmly established what member belonged to what club, the master membership list for the city

was removed from my custody and put under lock and key. In 1946, I was told by Elizabeth Searle that this master membership list had been destroyed. The clubs were—

.

THE WITNESS: The clubs were at that time encouraged to not keep a complete list of names and addresses, but to put it in such form they would be able to find their members but it would not be evident if someone else should happen to get hold of a list.

Do you wish me to continue with the security?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Were there any other actions taken of a similar character?

.

7709 THE WITNESS: The clubs were instructed to cease to mail notices of meetings, and the Party members were instructed to cease using the telephone for inter-party conversations, particularly with reference to notifying members of meetings. All this was supposed to be taken care of by personal contact. I will note that all of the clubs did not completely follow this discipline at this time.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: "This time" is when?

THE WITNESS: In 1946. There was additional crackdowns at later dates which made them really begin to follow these security measures.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What were the later dates?

THE WITNESS: In 1948, there was a new order put out. I will say that the industry clubs, the white collar clubs, where there were smaller memberships, did follow this in the earlier days. But in the community clubs where most of the members were known Communists anyway, they were a little more careless about their notification of meetings and that type of activity. But by early 1949, there was an ironclad rule that all the clubs follow that rule.

7710

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Can you recall any other measures which the leadership in the District of Columbia considered security measures? A. The group system was established. It was something that was a part of the Communist Party during the time I was there, that the leading members would have a group of two or three members who were not so active whom they would contact to take literature to, collect dues, notify of meetings, and that type of thing. Something that not too much emphasis had been placed on in the past. But this became a part of the security apparatus. The clubs were instructed to be sure that the whole membership was assigned on a group system, that some of the Party work was carried on the group system and in 1948 the clubs were instructed to have group meetings so that the groups could begin to take over the whole work of the Party clubs instead of a general Party club meeting.

In 1949, it was a practice to have the groups meet. This would be a group of three to five members, rather than a group of the whole club, which would meet instead, and it was a rare thing to have a whole club meeting in 1949 when I was last active.

Q. Were any instructions transmitted concerning action Party members were to take in the event of an emergency?

7711 THE WITNESS: In 1947, this was some time prior to the time that the group system was firmly established and something that was ready to go to work at that time, I was instructed by William Taylor or the Party Chairman at that time, that should any of the Party leaders be placed under arrest, the Party leadership in the District of Columbia, that I should go to work in one of the mass organizations in which the Communists had some influence in the city, and I would be contacted then by the Party leadership and given a Communist Party Assignment compatible with whatever I would be able to carry out with whatever conditions should exist.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Were you provided with any funds to use in case of emergency? A. I was given a sum of \$25 at this time as were all of the functionaries of the Communist Party. 7712 We were instructed to never have less money than this on our person at any time. We could use this to make telephone calls and anything which was necessary to notify the Party leadership should anyone be arrested to see that we could get legal counsel and any incidental expenses which should come up in case of any of the Party leaders being apprehended.

Q. Who gave you instructions as to what use you would make of this \$25? A. This was discussed in the city staff by William Taylor, Elizabeth Searle and myself. The proposal was made to the City Committee, and it was approved by the City Committee and after this approval it was carried out.

Q. As treasurer of the City Committee, were you given any instructions concerning the dissemination of information about money from dues or contributions? A. Prior to the time when it became a Party policy to refuse to answer any question on the ground of self incrimination under the First and Fifth Amendments, I was instructed by William C. Taylor that should I be asked for information as to where the Party funds of which I was custodian came from, I was to state that he gave me all the Party funds which I received, rather than the fact that I was getting these funds from various individual Party members and various Party clubs.

7713 Q. When was the policy of refusing to answer any questions about Party affairs adopted, and I am referring to the policy which was adopted locally.

MR. MARCANTONIO: Referring to what policy?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: The policy that was adopted locally.

THE WITNESS: This policy first came to my attention when one of our Party members was in court in Virginia in connection with a trade union case, and he was asked was he

a Party member, and he denied he was a Party member. This was a Party person who had been a known Communist for many, many years in Washington. At a City Committee meeting following that occasion, the resignation was post dated for this member to state that he was not a member on the date he said he was not a member, and he was re-recruited; and this member was told he should have taken the policy of the Hollywood Ten who had refused to answer questions before the Un-American Activities Committee, and realized that was the sensible thing to do. It was subsequent to this that a number of local party members were subpoenaed to appear before the Un-American Activities Committee and each of these were called before a special meeting with the top Party leadership and instructed on the things that they were to do before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In each case they refused to answer questions about their Party membership.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Can you recall the date of this event in Virginia about which you testified?

THE WITNESS: My best recollection would be that it would be very early 1948.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q: What was the name of the Party member who had denied membership in the Party in Virginia? A. Clarence Gurwitz. He was known as Casey in Party circles.

7715 Q. Was there a registration conducted by the Communist Party in the District of Columbia in 1948? A. You mean for the year 1948?

Q. Yes. A. Yes, there was a registration conducted in the late months of 1947 and very early 1948. In this registration, Party books were issued, Party registration cards were returned.

Q. Were the members instructed whether or not they were to place their names on the registration cards? A. They did not place their names on the registration cards, and it

was left to the discretion of the individual member whether or not he would place his name in his Party book. He kept that in his own custody.

Q. Was there a registration conducted for 1949? A. There was. On this occasion, no Party book was issued. Instead of registering any individual Party member, it would be done in a group of three people so you could not by 7716 just looking at a description of the person's age, employment, sex, race, where he was born, and so forth, deduct who any individual Party member was.

Q. Was any policy adopted in 1948 concerning membership lists? A. Clubs were given a very firm demand that they take a census of the Party club members to see whether anybody had a list and to be sure that any list in existence was destroyed at this time.

Q. Will you trace for us the method of transfer of members into and out of a local Party which was employed by the Communist Party subsequent to its reconstitution in 1945 and from that time until you ceased being active in 1949?

THE WITNESS: At the time the Party was reconstituted, there was in use by the Communist Political Association of the Communist Party a transfer card which had a serial number on it. It came in two sections, one to be given to the member transferring, one to be sent to the place to which he was transferring. It would contain his name, address, party book number, and the club from which he was coming, and the club to which he was to be assigned.

After the reconstitution of the Party, these trans- 7717 fers which had formerly been sent to a letter drop were taken entirely by courier instead of being sent through the mails on any occasion. Then it became the policy to not use the transfer card at all. The form—

MR. LaFOLLETTE: Before you go any further, can you give us some idea of the times at which these changes took place?

THE WITNESS: I believe perhaps the transfer form was not used after 1947 at the latest. These were sort of transition things, sometimes the policy would be to stop and someone would still use it. Also I would say the number of transfers, particularly in and out of Washington, slowed up with the end of the war, and that period. By 1949, instead of giving a member a transfer card, they would take a dollar bill and tear it in two, and the member would retain one half and the other half would be sent to the point of his destination so they could match the serial number when he arrived. But they were very, very careful about transferring a member. If anyone was in any way suspected in the least, they just didn't receive a transfer.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Were there any occasions at which you were present when Party members posed as non-members for the purpose of carrying out an assigned task?

7718 THE WITNESS: There was one specific instance during the period of the Communist Political Association when a Party member, a woman member of one of the white collar clubs, by the name of Sally Balik, had been assisting me with membership work prior to this time, and she came and informed me that she was not going to be a member of her white collar club any more, that Elizabeth Searle had asked her to be a go-between. I know Sally Balik stayed in the city of Washington. I saw her in the street, and had a friendly conversation with her at a later date, but she was never returned to our Party rolls as a Party member.

Q. Do you recall any other instances? A. There was another occasion toward the very end of 1949, one of the last meetings I attended of the City Committee, when we were looking for a replacement for a member of the City

7719 Committee, and Gertrude Evans, who is a long time Communist Party member in Washington, D. C., very respected by all the other members of the City Committee, she was suggested to be this replacement, and we were informed by the leadership that she was not available to take the post. The members of the City Committee protested this, saying that at this particular period in the late fall of 1949 certainly we needed the very best persons on the City Committee. They were told in fact to shut up and not talk about any member who has been made unavailable for any Party post. If the City leadership decides they are unavailable, then the rest of the City membership should just take it for granted that they are not to be discussed in any Party committee for any such post as this.

Q. Did you attend any meetings which were held under security conditions? A. I did.

7721 Q. Describe the meeting. A. In March 1949, the District Committee of the Communist Party held a very special meeting. It was considered a dry run, so to speak, to see how they could operate if they were under extreme attack.

7722 THE WITNESS: We were instructed as a matter of fact that this was such a meeting because we were supposed to use extreme security measures, and being certain we were not followed to our point of assembly. On my occasion, a group of five Party members in the District of Columbia met on a certain street corner at a certain minute. We did not wait for one of the Party members who was supposed to go with us who did not arrive on time. When we approached the City of Baltimore where this meeting was to be held, one of the Party members opened sealed orders which he had in his pocket which told him an address to which we were supposed to proceed and the specific minute at which we were supposed to arrive.

Various other groups of the District Committee—in other words, active members who were not necessarily members of the District Committee, were present at this meeting—and I started to state other groups were proceeding in very much the same manner as we were, each at a different time at which to arrive, but always within a very short period of time. The method of leaving the meeting was very similar so they did not turn the meeting into the streets of Baltimore at the same time.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Who presided at the meeting? A. Phil Frankfeld.

Q. Who is he? A. District chairman.

Q. Will you tell us what transpired at that meeting? A. The chief topic of discussion at that meeting was the question of the statement which had been made by Thorez, one of the French Party leaders, that the Communist Party members of France would not bear arms against the Soviet Union. This was the essence of what the statement was. The Communist Party leaders around the world had made similar statements. Eugene Dennis, I believe, in the name of the Communist Party of the United States had issued a similar statement. I believe William Foster joined with him in this statement, if I am not mistaken. Phil Frankfeld had made a statement to the Baltimore Sun along the same line, stating that the members of the Communist Party would not bear arms in any conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

7724 The point for discussion was approval of this statement which had been made by Phil Frankfeld. The sense of the persons there was unanimous approval with the exception of one Party member who thought that the timing of the statement was poor, since the leaders of the Communist Party were then undergoing the trial. He was censured at that time and referred to the District leadership for further discussion to see that he should change his mind and agree that no Party member should bear arms against the Soviet Union.

By the time the discussion around this was through, when the time came to vote on this approval of Phil Frankfeld's statement, it amounted to every person there taking an oath there that they would not bear arms against the Soviet Union.

7751 Q. Did the Communist Party of the District of Columbia have any provision for the distribution of the Cominform bulletin, "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!" to its members? A. Yes, they did. There
7752 was a decision made by the City Committee—I am certain this was carried out subsequent to the 1948 convention, which was held about August of 1948, whether it was carried out prior to that, I am not certain at this point—that free copies of the Cominform bulletin and of the Political Affairs would be made available with each issue to each member of the City Committee.

Q. Did the Communist Party for the District of Columbia conduct fund drives for the Daily Worker? A. They did. There was an annual fund drive.

Q. Did they conduct any while you were treasurer of the Communist Party for the District? A. There was one each year.

Q. Do you recall what those years were? A. I believe I took office in 1944, subsequent to the fund drive, so it would be '45, '46, '47, '48 and '49.

Q. What disposition was made of the money collected in the Daily Worker fund drives? A. A percentage of the money was kept for the overhead of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia. An additional percentage was forwarded through the District headquarters, some of which was retained in the District for the overhead of the District organization, and the remainder of which was forwarded to the national office to go to the National Communist

7753 Party and to the Daily Worker. In 1949, because the Washington, D. C. Daily Worker was in debt, 10 per cent of the money as it was collected was assigned and given to the Washington Daily Worker office.

Q. Did you as treasurer participate in the distribution of these funds? A. I signed the checks by which this money was distributed.

Q. Did any of the Communist Party members with whom you came in contact in the District tell you that they had attended the Lenin Institute in Moscow?

THE WITNESS: William Taylor told me on more than one occasion in informal person to person conversation that he, I believe in the year 1935, had gone to Moscow.

7761 Q. Did the local leadership of the Communist Party, that is the District of Columbia, sponsor a study of the so-called Classics of Marxism and Leninism? A. Yes, they did.

Q. Can you remember any instances at which study was sponsored and any books or pamphlets which were mentioned in connection with the study? A. On May 10, 1948, at a city board meeting, William Taylor, the Party Chairman, suggested that every board member read "Foundations of Leninism," "Mastering Bolshevism," "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," and "The Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States."

In addition to the board members, he wanted the club educational directors and leading members of the clubs to read, study and become thoroughly familiar with these basic works.

(The document referred to was marked for identification as Petitioner's exhibit No. 335.)

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. I show you Petitioner's Exhibit 335 for identification, and which is a pamphlet entitled, "Mastering Bolshevism" by Joseph Stalin, and I ask you if you read or studied
7762 a similar pamphlet with the identical text as that pamphlet in front of you. A. Yes, I did.

7763 Q. Did the Communist Party of the District of Columbia ever initiate a series of courses on any of the classics? A. They did. There was a series initiated in the early months of 1949, called the ABC's of Marxism. One class was held on the 25th of February 1949. The reading material for that class was "Imperialism" and "State and Revolution."

MR. LAFOLLETTE: "Imperialism" is one book, and "State and Revolution" is another book?

THE WITNESS: That is right. The instructor at that 7764 class was Isador Pascoff, who had the title of educational director for the city.

THE WITNESS: His remarks on imperialism dealt mainly with the Marshall Plan. He stated that it was a pump priming thing which was certain to lead the United States to bankruptcy.

The second class was on the "State and Revolution" pamphlet, but one of the key centers of discussion was again the Foster-Dennis statement on the Thorez statement. Isador Pascoff stated that this had more than normal significance for members of the Communist Party in the United States. He compared the socialist government in the Soviet Union to the American form of government with the favorable comparison going toward the Soviet government.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: When was this second one held?

THE WITNESS: That was on March 4. On February 25, we had a class conducted by Charles Payne. The subject matter for that class was on "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." There he stated that with the growth of imperialist nations, specifically speaking of the United States, that the world would be divided into two camps, that it would 7765 be the imperialist camp and that of the democracies moving towards socialism and these democracies moving towards socialism would be bound to be triumphant in the future.

By MR. TAYLOR:

Q. What did you say the date of the class conducted by Mr. Charles Payne was? A. March 25.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You said February. Do you mean March?

THE WITNESS: I meant March. The first class was on February 25.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Was the class held by Pascoff—

THE WITNESS: February 25.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: And a class by Pascoff.

THE WITNESS: On March 4, and one by Payne on March 25.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: All right.

THE WITNESS: That is the extent of the classes.

By MR. TAYLOR:

7766 Q. Do you recall hearing Alexander Trachtenberg speak? A. Alexander Trachtenberg attended a City Committee meeting in May of 1949. He did not make a major speech but took part in the discussion by the members of the committee. The essence of what he contributed to the discussion was that there was a need to raise the level of understanding of the Marxist classics by the leadership and by the general membership, that the only Communist who could be expected to stand up under attack would be one who was thoroughly based in the Marxist classics. He mentioned that the Jefferson School in New York was being used to train and teach Communist leaders. He stated that every club of the Communist Party should have a set of the Lenin Library, and if it was not possible for them to obtain a set of the Lenin Library, they should have as a minimum a set of the Little Lenin Library.

In addition to that, he stated that it was the duty of all Communist Party leaders to be so thoroughly familiar with the Communist Party classics that they could readily refer to them to help them analyze any current situation, to be able to apply the basic Marxist principles to any current situation at any time.

Q. Mrs. Markward, on the basis of your active participation in the Communist Party for a six year period, can you recall any instances in which criticism was leveled by the local party leadership or by the national Party leadership against the policies or activities of the Soviet Union?

THE WITNESS: I do not.

Q. In those instances in which policies of the United States Government and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union appeared to be in conflict, did the leaders of the Communist Party either nationally or locally to the best of your knowledge ever express sympathy with the policies of the United States Government? A. They did not.

7788 CROSS EXAMINATION

Q. And an agent from the FBI called to see you? A. That is correct.

Q. It was then that he suggested that you act as an informer for the FBI, is that right? A. It was there that we had a discussion about the role we felt the Communist Party in the United States was playing, and I volunteered that if it would be any help for me to join the Communist Party and furnish this information, I would like to do it.

Q. Was it you who volunteered the idea of joining the Communist Party or was it he who suggested it to you? A. I believe the question was how could I as a patriotic American citizen help my government through the FBI in this connection. He said that the way would be to join the Communist Party and furnish information.